

monuments of our Nation's Capital. These monuments were built to honor great people and great events, and each has its own inspirational story to tell. What you will find in each of these stories is that the greatness of our country and of its leaders was founded in the willingness of common men and women, our veterans, to risk their lives defending the principles of right and democracy. Serving both at home and on foreign soil, their service must always be remembered.

Working in Washington in this great institution of the U.S. Senate and among these beautiful monuments frequently reminds me of the sacrifices of our veterans. Even outside of Washington, in almost every town across America, there are monuments dedicated to our veterans. I urge each American to discover their story, not only from a historical perspective, but also through the eyes of the veterans living in their communities where you will find common men and women who simply did the right thing when called upon to do so by their country. Because of them, we live in a world where there is more peace than ever before. They deserve our thanks.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MURKOWSKI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. MURKOWSKI pertaining to the introduction of S. 1402 and S. 1403 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

BORDER IMPROVEMENT AND IMMIGRATION ACT OF 1997

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to offer my support for Senate bill 1360, Senator ABRAHAM's Border Improvement and Immigration Act introduced November 4. This legislation has already numerous cosponsors and is bipartisan in nature.

This bill clarifies a provision included in the 1996 Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act. Section 110 of last year's immigration law requires the establishment of an automated entry and exit control system. While the merits of this provision are admirable, unfortunately, the reality is that this is not a feasible concept.

The section would require documentation of every alien entering and leaving our country. Can you imagine? To document entry and exit of every foreign national, every alien entering the United States would be required to hold a visa or passport or some sort of border crossing identification card.

In my State alone, Mr. President, Canadians are at our border. We are separated from the rest of the United States by Canada. We enjoy relatively free passage between the two countries as Americans. This facilitates trade and strengthens our historical ties of

friendship. To require the documentation of entry and exit of Canadians would result in Canada requesting the same type of consideration. Of course, our Canadian neighbors would be forced to wait in long lines. Trade would be disrupted. And it would develop a feeling of distrust. This is simply unacceptable.

When former Senator Simpson crafted this immigration reform proposal last year, he did not intend to create a new documentation requirement for our northern neighbors. Rather, the issue he wished to address was the illegal overstay rates of foreign nationals.

I cannot agree more that the illegal overstays need to be addressed. The Immigration and Naturalization Service currently cannot provide accurate data on overstay rates. However, the answer does not lie in requiring documentation of every alien entering through our land points of entry.

Section 110, if implemented as is, will only create more headaches for our friends and neighbors attempting to enter the United States and slow both trade and commerce that crosses our land border each day. It will do little to address my primary concern about overstay rates and subsequent illegal immigration.

For these reasons, I am supporting Senator ABRAHAM's efforts to correct section 110 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 and exempt land entry border points from collecting a record of arrivals and departures. I hope that my other colleagues join me in cosponsoring S. 1360, the Border Improvement and Immigration Act of 1997.

Mr. President, I would like to make one more statement, if I may, with the indulgence of my friend from Wyoming.

INTERNATIONAL CLIMATE TREATY

Mr. MURKOWSKI. There has been an awful lot of concern relative to the issue of global warming, greenhouse gases, carbon dioxide emissions, et cetera.

This December, representatives of 166 nations are going to meet in Kyoto, Japan, to broker a new international climate treaty. This treaty will set new emissions controls for carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases.

Unfortunately, 130 of the 166 nations, including China, Mexico, and South Korea, are explicitly exempt from the new emissions controls or any new commitments whatsoever. As a consequence, it is my opinion that such a treaty simply cannot work and will not be ratified by the Senate.

Even if one favors strong action to curb carbon emissions, there are three key reasons to oppose the approach embodied in the draft treaty.

The first reason is, selectively applied emissions limits will harm large sectors of our economy.

Analysts expect even the most modest versions of the treaty to cost over

a million and a half jobs by the year 2005, along with cumulative losses in gross domestic product exceeding \$16 trillion from the year 2005 to the year 2015.

While the President claims the new global climate treaty will not harm the economy, the administration abandoned its internal analysis after their economic models predicted disaster—even when rosy assumptions were factored in. So bad were the results that the administration refused to even appear at a hearing of our Energy and Natural Resources Committee to comment on the treaty's economic impacts.

Second, the environmental benefits of this treaty are really questionable, Mr. President.

Any treaty without new commitments for developing nations will encourage the movement of production, capital, jobs, and emissions from the 36 nations subject to emissions controls to the 130 nations that are not.

Actual global emissions will not decrease. Only their point of origin will change.

Ironically, because of our industrial processes, which are more energy efficient than those found in developing nations, global carbon emissions per unit of production would, in my opinion, actually increase. In other words, we would endure economic pain for no identifiable environmental gain.

Third, selectively applied emissions controls will doom any climate treaty that contains them.

By an overwhelming vote of 95 to 0, this body, the U.S. Senate, passed a resolution in July demanding any new climate treaty contain new obligations—new obligations—for developing nations. At the same time, Mr. President, developing nations refuse to sign up to such a treaty. Thus, selectively applied emissions controls have become the so-called poison pill that is preventing the world from reasonably addressing the climate change issue.

So I think it is time to be a bit pragmatic. If we want to keep a new climate treaty from becoming an international embarrassment, we should reconsider the rush to Kyoto and expand solutions that really work.

What can really work, Mr. President?

One is nuclear energy. One is hydropower. For instance, nuclear energy produces roughly a third of our electricity without significant emissions of carbon dioxide. Yet, President Clinton's global warming explicitly ignores these sources of virtually carbon-free energy.

Even worse, Mr. President, the Clinton administration threatens—and has threatened numerous—to veto any nuclear waste legislation and continues to consider proposals to tear down hydropower dams, policies that endanger the carbon-free solutions that are in place today, and calls into question the administration's commitment to reduce our carbon emissions in a balanced, responsible manner.

We even see the Sierra Club come out against wind power claiming that the windmills are some kind of Cuisinart that decimates the bird population.

What does our President propose?

It is rather interesting to reflect on where we are now because he has come almost full circle. The President hints at some vague notion of meeting our emissions targets through electricity restructuring, but he is very short on specifics. Perhaps the President is playing to the headlines today, but leaving the details to tomorrow or to the next administration.

His proposal is that we, by the year 2008 to 2011, reduce our emissions to the level of 1990. Well, where is his administration going to be by that time? So they are just putting these things off as opposed to coming up with the mechanics that will work.

There are, in fact, things that we can do in the context of energy restructuring that can help restabilize our carbon emissions. We have had some 13 hearings on this subject in my committee, the Energy Committee, and we have heard from 120 witnesses. Thus, I am prepared to suggest some of the specifics that the President has not suggested.

For example, we can provide for stranded cost recovery of the more than 100 nuclear power reactors that together provide some 22 percent of our total electric power generation.

We can provide incentives to encourage or require regions to employ a mix of carbon-free wind, solar, nuclear, or hydropower adequate to achieve a specified carbon-free emissions standard.

We can offer a means to certify the claims of power producers who wish to market their power to consumers as low-carbon or carbon-free.

And we can offer assistance for market-led investments in new research towards carbon-free or low-carbon energy.

There is no shortage of policies we can pursue if we really want to address the issue of carbon emissions. We can be encouraged about recent technology breakthroughs in fuel cell technology, wind energy, solar technologies, and advanced nuclear plant designs.

In the end, I think, Mr. President, American ingenuity, technological innovation, and common sense will produce the solutions that the U.N. negotiations thus far have been unable to provide.

Finally, Mr. President, we need to employ these new technologies to increase energy efficiency, promote conservation, and stabilize our carbon emissions—but we do not need a flawed treaty that cannot get the job done. The climate issue is serious, but so are issues of equity, economic prosperity, and pragmatism.

During the last round of negotiations at Bonn, the draft treaty got worse. It got worse, not better. As a consequence, we need to prepare ourselves and the American people for the prospect that the new treaty will be unwor-

thy of support, even if you are deeply concerned about the increase of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, as I am. In other words, it doesn't do us any good to board a fast train, a fast train that is going in the wrong direction, particularly if all nations of the world aren't aboard.

I yield the floor.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent the period for morning business now be extended until the hour of 1:30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FAST TRACK

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the fast-track bill that is before us. I have followed the debate on this legislation very closely. I have listened to my colleagues discuss at length the issues of trade flows, foreign direct investment, the delegation of authority, and unfair trade agreements. It has been an interesting debate for this freshman Senator.

I want to share with my colleagues the feelings that my constituents have expressed to me. Many of them have deep concerns about our progress on trade. Intense import competition makes them feel as if they have been left behind in the pursuit of fair trade.

There is an issue here that is far more important to my constituents than trade, however, but it is inextricably linked to their ability to compete. While the administration vows to fight for fair trade with foreign countries, people in Wyoming want this administration to fight for fair regulation in this country. For them, fair trade will not stimulate economic growth when their growth is halted by unreasonable regulations.

It seems that there is a real disconnect in our administration's policies on economic health. While one side of the administration is promoting job growth in exports, the other side is shutting down our enterprises with overly restrictive environmental regulations.

There is an inconsistency here that is difficult to explain to people in Wyoming. They do not understand why the administration supports export growth, but allows the Environmental Protection Agency to issue and adopt regulations such as the new particulate matter and ozone standards for air quality.

How does this relate to the fast-track bill we are debating? It connects in two ways. The first issue is jobs. The purpose of the bill before us is to promote job growth—which is a good purpose and I support it. Unreasonable regulatory mandates, however, do not create jobs. Second, like fast track, environmental regulation is a delegated authority. And in my opinion, it is one

delegated authority that is out of control.

Let me first discuss what is wrong with the standards and how they will destroy jobs. They were formulated and adopted with a disturbing lack of scientific consensus; with no accountability; and with a genuine disregard for the real effects they will have on working people.

The accuracy of scientific information in the formulation of scientific rules is critical for a democracy. Democracies cannot survive without being able to rely on the precision of their scientific information. Furthermore, democracies cannot survive when bureaucracies are able to impose expensive mandates without any accountability. Democracy depends on representation along with taxation. Bureaucrats must consult with elected representatives before imposing massive costs on our citizens.

With the adoption of these unreasonable standards, the EPA and the administration have failed on both of these counts.

There are numerous examples that show a lack of scientific consensus in the promulgation of these new air quality standards. The EPA's own Clean Air Science Advisory Committee, stated that at this point, "there is no adequately articulated scientific basis for making regulatory decisions concerning a particulate matter National Ambient Air Quality Standard."

The administration's National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences dismissed the EPA's claims about the relationship between childhood asthma and air quality. They observed that the asthma rate in Philadelphia has soared even as that city's air pollution levels have plummeted. They also noted that some of the highest asthma rates in the world occur in Australia and New Zealand—two countries with excellent air quality.

Strangely enough, while the EPA is promulgating expensive rules, other agencies have been pushing for economic growth. The U.S. Trade Representative, the Department of Commerce, the Small Business Administration, and the Department of Agriculture—have all advocated the importance of fast track for growth.

Even the President has emphasized the need for fast track in terms of job creation. He stressed that,

"In order for us to continue to create jobs and opportunities for our own people, and to maintain our world leadership, we have to continue to expand exports . . . We have to act now to continue [our] progress to make sure our economy will work for all the American people."

Well, I stand here to tell you that unreasonably expensive regulations will not make our economy work for all American people. Achievements in trade expansion will not overcome the excessive costs imposed by regulatory mandates.

And the costs are excessive. At first, the EPA estimated the cost would be